DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 446 24 RC 008 576

TITLE The Indian Education Act of 1972. Report of Progress for the Second Year of the Program.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Indian Education.
REPORT NO DHEW-OE-75-02401
PUB DATE 14 Apr 75
NOTE 43p.; For related document, see RC 008 568

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; *American Indians; Change Agents; Comparative Analysis; *Cost Effectiveness; *Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Interviews; Financial Support; Grants; Information Dissemination; *Program Evaluation; Quality Control; Student Enrollment; Tables (Data); Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *National Indian Education Act 1972

ABSTRACT

Program implementation under the American Indian Education Act of 1972 (IEA) is evaluated in this progress report via narrative and tabular data relative to the following: (1) Comparative Overview of 1973 and 1974 Title IV-IEA Programs (project funding, entitlement, and eligibility; grants and funding; Indian pupil enrollment; per pupil expenditure of Title IV grant award funds; and size of grant); (2) Applications for Funding (a summary, a 1973/1974 comparison, and 1974 application rejections); (3) Performance Reports (accomplishment of objectives by objective type as reported by district); (4) Evaluation Improvement Effort (quality control conferences, field capability improvement conferences, and needs for technical assistance); (5) Field Study (survey of project directors, parent committee chairpersons, and staff members to determine project effectiveness and to describe project planning, operation, and evaluation procedures); and (6) Possible Administrative Actions (relative to the following major conclusions: (a) projects seem to be gaining in community support; (b) there is strong evidence of project effectiveness; (c) communication problems between school administrations and Indian communities indicate a need for standardization of terminology; and (d) financial support is best spent on special staff). (JC)

ED107446

DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-02401

The Indian Education Act of 1972

Report of Progress

for the Second Year of the Program

Prepared by
Office of Indian Education
U.S. Office of Education

April 14, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RC 008 576

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary
Virginia Y. Trotter, Assistant Secretary for Education
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
T.H. Bell, Commissioner

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED—No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

Cover Illustration By

LEROY L. SETH
Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho

0003

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

June 11, 1975

Dear Colleague:

The following is a brief summary of the second annual progress report on the "Indian Education Act of 1972." This overview is presented to insure dissemination of information about the progress of projects which are administrated by the Office of Education, Office of Indian Education. You will find that fiscal year 1974-75 has been a year of encouragement and inspiration for those working in Indian education.

The progress report shows that, in two years, the Title IV program has grown at a rate two times that of other Federal programs. For example;

(1) total program applications increased 100% in 1974-75. In 1973-74, 547 applications were received. In 1974-75 this number rose to 1,098.

(2) total number of projects funded increased by 96%.

The latest count of Indian children who are enrolled in public school is 334,495, an increase of 57% from 1973-74 school year. Out of the total enrollment 212,938 are receiving services under Title IV as a result of a Part A grant to their respective school district. This means that 121,587 Indian children in public school are not given the opportunity to benefit from Title IV programs. The grant amount varies among funded school districts. For example, in 1974 the range of per pupil expenditure in Title IV projects varied from $74.00 in Alabama to $195.00 in New York. Fifty percent of the grants funded were under $10,000; 18.9% were in the range of $20,000 to $49,999.

To insure continued progress in the Title IV projects, a National Program Monitoring and Program Evaluation System is being designed to draw from local evaluations. To promote improvement of field evaluation processes a series of three five-day Quality Control Conferences and ten three-day Field Capability Improvement Conferences were held. The conference participants identified the following technical assistance needs:

(1) information about how to interpret Federal Regulations, Office of Indian Education application and reporting requirements;

(2) advice concerning evaluation skills and services; and

(3) advice on curriculum development and materials.

Due to the fact that an analysis of project operations is an evaluation component of the Office of Indian Education, information from the field was gathered through an interview and monitoring study of the projects.

The results of the field study indicated the following:

- Regarding the effectiveness of project operations, 90% of the project directors rated their project as very effective in some ways; 50% rated the program as very effective in most aspects; 6% rated their projects ineffective.

- As to whether the projects were properly targeted, of the 93% of the project directors who responded, 60% gave a definite yes, 33% gave a guarded reply, one director replied no. Parent committee members responded 54% yes, 28% guarded, and 6% no responses.

- Cost effectiveness information indicated that investments in staff and materials appeared to raise the level of program effectiveness.

- Areas of concern mentioned most frequently by project directors were communications 22% and funding 17%; of concerns expressed by the parent committee members 75% were in reference to the school system and the 23% to severity of need.

If the Office of Indian Education can be of further assistance in providing information about the Title IV program, please contact our office by writing to:

Office of Indian Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 4047
Washington, D.C. 20202

We look forward to your continued interest and support in Indian education.

Sincerely,

William G. Demmert, Jr.
Deputy Commissioner
Office of Indian Education

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.--No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

6/7'

PREFACE

The Indian Education Act of 1972 (IEA) is now in the second year of its existence. Little could be reported at the end of the first year to address the effectiveness of field projects in meeting the special educational needs of Indian children. Information at that time included such things as kinds and numbers of projects funded, funding levels, numbers of students involved, staffing, distribution of funds by States, etc. However, no data were available on which to evaluate successes or failures of project activities or to indicate the reactions of Indian communities, school staff people, and Indian parents to the intent and scope of the Act.

During the course of the second year, a systematic data collection effort was implemented to gather information which would form a major part of a data base on the Indian Education Act Program. Information from the data base could then be retrieved which would reflect (1) the impact of IEA on the special educational needs of Indian pupils, (2) analytical data on goals and objectives of projects and the degree to which such goals and objectives have been met, (3) a basis for comparison between the first year and second year of program operation, and (4) data sufficient for drawing valid conclusions and on which decisions and actions can be based at various levels of administration and operation.

This report is a summary of the data gathered on the second year of IEA operations, a review of the first year, a comparison of the 2 years, conclusions drawn from analyzed data, and recommendations for change.

0008

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface ..	iii
Summary	1
A Review of The Indian Education Act of 1972	5
Summary of Report on First Year of Progress	7
Restatement of FY 1973 Recommendations	7
Actions Taken on FY 1973 Recommendations	8
Comparative Overview of Fiscal Years 1973 and 1974 Title IV-IEA Program	10
Project Funding, Entitlement and Eligibility	10
Grants and Funding	11
Indian Pupil Enrollment	11
Per Pupil Expenditure of Title IV Grant Award Funds	15
Size of Grants	15
Applications	18
Part A Summary	18
Part A: Comparison of First Year's Applications and Second Year's Applications	18
Rejection of Applications	19
Performance Reports	22
Evaluation Improvement Effort	24
Quality Control Conferences	24
Field Capability Improvement Conferences	25
Needs for Technical Assistance	25
Field Study	28
Introduction	28
Description of the Study	28
Results of the Study	29
Conclusions	32
Possible Administrative Actions	33

p. IV blank

0009

INDEX OF TABLES

Table Number	Title	Page
I	A Comparison of Eligible Districts, Applications and Funding, FY 1973 and FY 1974	10
II	FY 1973 and 1974 Grants and Funding	11
III	Comparative Analysis of Part A Projects for Fiscal Years 1973 and 1974	12
IV	Reported Indian Pupil Enrollment by States	14
V	Relation Between Size of Grant and Number of Indians with the Recipient LEA, FY 1973-1974	16
VI	Changes in Relative Emphasis of Frequently Identified Needs: Comparison of Part A Applications for FY 1974 and FY 1975	20
VII	Changes in Relative Emphasis of Frequently Proposed Objectives: Comparison of Part A Applications for FY 1974 and FY 1975	21
VIII	Denial of Applications for FY 1974 Funding	21
IX	Accomplishment of Objectives by Type of Objective Part A First Year Programs (FY 1973)	23
X	Participant Evaluation of Usefulness of Quality Control Conferences	26
XI	Number of Respondents Identifying Each Need as Among Their Projects' Three Highest Priority Needs for Technical Assistance	27
XII	Major Problems Identified by Parent Committees and Project Directors	31
XIII	Cost Effectiveness on Projects Judged as Reaching Students	31

0010

SUMMARY

Parent committees, school personnel, and Indian communities strongly support the continuation, further development, and expansion of the Indian Education Act (Title IV of P.L. 92-318).

Indian people, Indian communities, and Indian educators recognize the precedent set for Indian control by the IEA legislation as a major step toward self-determination. The long overdue involvement of Indian people in Indian education is mandated by the Act. It has now become important that the education of Indian pupils is closely related to, and largely determined by, Indian people.

Indian control is a major feature of the Act, and it implies changes which are shaped by the Indians' viewpoints of quality education and not by the viewpoints of the molders of Federal Indian policy. The success or failure of the changes implemented by IEA projects can now be measured by Indian standards of excellence as well as by traditional public educational standards. The fact that public school education has not to date met the needs of Indians is supported by the following items of information:

1. 37 percent of the adult Indian heads of households have not completed grade school; only 14 percent have completed high school; only 2 percent have completed 4-year degree programs, and only 1 percent have completed graduate school.

2. The illiteracy rate among the Navajos, the largest Indian tribe, is 90 percent.

3. The average educational level for all Indians under Federal supervision is less than 6 school years.

4. Among Indian school youth the dropout rate ranges from 45 percent to 62 percent; 50 percent of the total number of Indian pupils have high rates of absenteeism.

The new awareness of the Federal Government of the need for changes in curriculum, attitudes, teaching techniques and relevant materials, as evidenced by the enactment of the Act, has afforded the opportunity to address the special needs of Indian pupils in public schools. The already growing Indian interest in the education of Indian children has been intensified and expanded by the intent of the law and by the requirement for Indian involvement.

Relevant Indian education shaped by Indian participation in determining program focus, identifying staff, selecting activities, and evaluating the effectiveness of the project is the main thrust of the Act. It is the only legislation which permits delving into the areas of Indian culture and tradition in order to reinforce pride in Indian heritage and to create a more worthwhile relationship between the Indian child and the school system in which he or she learns.

After 2 years of operation, a systematic analysis of the Act was conducted to provide a picture of the progress attained by projects supported under this legislation. From data collected by field study and conferences, the following major conclusions can be drawn:

1. Data profiles now show that Title IV IEA has moved as far in 2 years as other Federal programs have progressed in 4 years. In developmental aspects, the IEA program now closely resembles past Federal programs but is moving at a faster pace. Over the first 2 program years, there has been a movement away from general academic remediation and social adjustment activities (such as health-centered, dropout prevention programs) to Indian cultural and child-centered (such as self-concept and Indian pride) activities. There has been less emphasis on staff development programs and on vocational guidance programs and more emphasis on social motivation programs and academic achievement through motivation and attitude changes. Finally, more emphasis has been placed on attempting to recruit and hire teachers and aides of Indian ancestry. To summarize, there has been a movement away from making the Indian child fit the school system and toward making the school system conform to the Indian child's needs.

2. Projects are addressing the needs of the Indian community and are acquiring local Indian community support. Because both Indian community and school system personnel are involved in most projects from the needs assessment through the final evaluation, the entire project develops as a venture which is based on coordination of effort to achieve a specific goal. This manner of operation could either develop supportive attitudes, or bring out dichotomies of philosophies, attitudes, and concepts which render both groups ineffective. It appears from the data that supportive attitudes are being developed in local IEA projects.

3. There was marked agreement between parent committee memb rs and project directors on the apparent effectiveness of the Title IV projects. In rating effectiveness on a scale from "very effective" to "very ineffective," responding parent committee representatives rated their projects as follows:

Very effective	- 25%)
Effective	- 26%)

Somewhat effective	- 32%)	83%
Rather ineffective	- 2%	
Very ineffective	- 2%	
Non-response	- 12%	

The ratings by project directors were:

Very effective	- 21%)	
Effective	- 30%)	91%
Somewhat effective	- 40%)	
Rather ineffective	-)	
Very ineffective	-)	6%
Non-response	-)	

4. Communication problems exist between parent committee members and project directors. Interpretations of terms vary greatly among these two groups and this leads to a multitude of problems in ensuring that the thrust of Title IV projects are directed toward the needs and requirements of the local communities. Parent committee members do not speak in categories, while project staff do. For example, a parent committee will speak of "problems with the school system." Project staff will speak of problems of "staffing," "curriculum," "operations," etc.

   A standard terminology or translation mechanism should be developed for use among all levels of participation in the IEA program.

5. The most effective projects are those which invest the largest dollar amounts on special staff -- professional, paraprofessional, and non-professional. Staff members who have special abilities to perform successfully in areas that address the special needs of Indian students, and who have the necessary qualities of awareness and sensitivity to Indian students, are the most effective components in IEA projects.

6. A high priority need, expressed by parent committee members, project directors, and school administrators, is for information and interpretation of Federal rules and regulations. Requests for information cover such areas as funding, applications, evaluation, reporting, and information about what other IEA projects are doing with successful results. Parent committees are in special need of information as to their total area of function, the school systems in which they work, and what activities are being successfully carried on by other projects.

   In addition to technical assistance, the foregoing suggests a need for some type of project information exchange among Title IV projects -- a network of dissemination of project descriptions

which would be available to all Title IV projects.

With the strengthening of communications, the provision of technical assistance, and the delivery of information needed by projects, perceptions of school system personnel and local Indian community membership regarding the quality of Indian education will be strengthened to an even higher degree than the current state.

0014

A REVIEW OF THE INDIAN EDUCATION ACT OF 1972

Over the past decade, human problems created by years of neglect and discrimination, coupled with increased militancy, have generated public concern for the plight of U.S. citizens of Native American descent.

The problems included poor health and environmental conditions, low income, unemployment, illiteracy, lack of self-awareness and a multitude of other ills that befall a minority population that has been oppressed for generations.

One long-range solution to the problems was determined to be special attention to the education of young Indian Americans and, to a lesser extent, of adults within that population. While there was some scattered legislation that was applicable to assist in the education of selected groups of Indian Americans, there was no direct focus on special and specific problems. For the most part, this legislation categorized American Indians into general educationally disadvantaged groupings without recognizing the unique or specific educational needs that had to be served.

In June 1972, the Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the Indian Education Act of 1972. This legislation specifically directs Indian participation in Indian education, and provides for programs to be developed on local levels to meet the most urgent local needs. Five provisions form the basis of the IEA program:

Part A: Provides for grants to local education agencies to develop and carry out elementary and secondary school programs specifically designed to meet the special educational needs of Indian pupils.

Part B: Provides for grants to State and local educational agencies (LEA's), Federally supported elementary and secondary schools for Indian children, and to Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions to support planning, pilot and demonstration projects to develop, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for improving educational opportunities for Indian children. Also provided for are educational enrichment programs and services, preparation of teachers of Indian students, information dissemination and program evaluation.

Part C: Provides for grants to State and LEA's and to Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to develop, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for providing adult education for Indians, for the dissemination of information concerning educational programs, services, and resources available to Indian adults, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of Federally assisted programs in which Indian adults may participate.

Part D: Provides for the establishment of The Office of Indian Education, the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner of Indian Education and the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

Part E: Provides for grants to prepare teachers of Indian children, with preference granted to Indians. Part E also provides for recognition of certain schools on or near reservations to be classified as "LEA's."

Under the provisions of the legislation, programs can be developed and conducted in ways which preserve the heritage and cultural integrity of the students and communities being served.

Charged with directing and monitoring the program, the Office of Education (OE) responded by:

1. Funding the development and conduct of special instructional programs geared to the needs of Indian students.

2. Ensuring the participation of parents and the Indian community in determining and stating those needs.

3. Funding special counseling and tutorial services, including training of nonprofessionals from among the populations being served.

4. Funding developing inservice training for teachers to become more understanding of, and sensitive to, the special educational needs of Indian students within the multicultural school system.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON FIRST YEAR OF PROGRESS

In fiscal year 1973, many eligible districts and organizations did not apply for funding because of time constraints caused by the late release of impounded funds.

Under Part A, 435 school districts (LEA's) were funded. These districts included 59 percent of all enrolled Indian pupils in the 2565 eligible districts. These LEA's, located throughout 31 states, were awarded nearly $11 million.

Ten Indian-controlled school districts located on or near reservations in seven states received awards totaling $547,618 under the 5 percent set-aside provision of the Act for such districts.

Part B grant awards for $5 million were made to 51 Indian tribes and organizations, as well as to State and local education agencies. These grants were for planning, model and demonstration projects in such areas as bilingual-bicultural education, compensatory education, cultural enrichment, dropout prevention, and vocational training. (21 States)

Under Part C of the Act, 10 grants were awarded for Indian adult education in the amount of $500,000. Nine States had Part C projects approved.

In general, the needs identified by funded districts were reflective of the special educational needs of local communities. A majority of the grantees under Parts A and B designed their projects to attempt to meet the most compelling of these needs. Overall, the proposed expenditures made during this first year were reasonably consistent with the proposed objectives, with some exceptions, especially in the area of staff development.

Restatement of Fiscal Year 1973 Recommendations

Four major considerations emerged from data collected on the first year of operation of Title IV projects which relate to possible top-level administrative action to increase the effectiveness of the Act.

Simply stated these considerations were:

1. Make provision for technical assistance to local school districts in the area of program development and evaluation.

0017

2. Make provisions for research grants to cover three key areas:

   (a) Financing and targeting of special programs

   (b) Developing teaching methods and techniques for use by both Indian and non-Indian teachers in teaching basic skills and cultural heritage to Indian students

   (c) Developing appropriate instructional materials to be used along with the new methods and techniques

3. Increasing efforts to recruit, train, and place Indian teachers and administrators in public school systems for instructional improvement and cultural enrichment.

4. Expanding the potential benefits of the Act to include:

   (a) Preschool children

   (b) Districts with fewer than 10 Indian pupils (possibly by combining grants to districts which are close enough geographically to develop interdistrict programs)

   (c) Out-of-school youth

Actions Taken on Fiscal Year 1973 Recommendations

Several activities were undertaken to respond to these recommendations. First, with respect to technical assistance, several projects were undertaken. A series of conferences were held at various strategic locations around the country to provide technical assistance relating to critical areas as identified by Parts A, B, and C grantees. Topics discussed at these conferences included rules and regulations, role of the parent committees, educational evaluation of projects and funding criteria under the various provisions of IEA. Additionally, a project was initiated to develop a media kit for parent committee members dealing with the primary educational and administrative issues confronting them in the conduct of their responsibilities.

The recommendation relating to the provisions for grants in certain areas was partially implemented by completely revising and expanding the rules and regulations for Parts B and C of the Act to include a substantial priority list for applicants to respond to. These priorities included and emphasized provisions for early childhood education, teaching methodology, and the development of instructional materials and techniques. A study, entitled The Impact of Federal Funds on Local Educational Agencies Enrolling Indian Children, was also undertaken and completed. This effort included an extensive analysis of the financing of Indian education at the

local level.

Efforts to recruit, train, and place Indian teachers and administrators in the public school system were hampered by the lack of available funding for the teacher training provisions of IEA. However, one of the priorities developed for the Part B regulations and suggested in the fiscal year 1976 budget was a teacher training component, and a substantial, but certainly inadequate, number of projects will be funded from this budget.

Expansion of the potential benefits of the Act to include preschool children and a wider range of eligibility for districts and out-of-school youth were not possible in the one year period between the first progress report and the current one. This was because developing and promulgating recommendations for legislative change is a lengthy and difficult process and generally takes longer than the time available between these two reports. However, planning efforts for legislative changes have been initiated and these activities will be vigorously pursued.

0019

COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW OF FISCAL YEARS 1973 AND 1974 TITLE IV IEA PROGRAM

Project Funding, Entitlement, and Eligibility

The second year of operation of the Title IV Indian Education Act Part A-LEA program brought an increase of project funding from $11 million (approximately 10.25 percent of the entitlement) to almost $23 million for Part A-LEA grants to public school districts. The $24 million represents approximately 7.3 percent of the total entitlement of $310,999,995 for Part A-LEA projects.*

As shown in table I, the number of eligible school districts increased by 56 from 2,565 to 2,621 or a 2 percent increase. However, in spite of the small increase in the eligible districts, the numbers of LEA's applying for grants doubled. For the 1973-74 school year 547 Part A-LEA applications were submitted; for the 1974-75 school year 1,098 applications were received. Of the 1,098 applications, 854 were approved and funded.

TABLE I

A COMPARISON OF ELIGIBLE DISTRICTS, APPLICATIONS, AND FUNDING FY 1973 AND FY 1974

Total Eligible Districts		Total Applications		Total Funded	
1973-74	1974-75	1973-74	1974-75	1973-74	1974-75
2565	2621	547	1098	435	854
2% increase		100% increase		96% increase	

*Full entitlement refers to the Part A total authorization. This amount is the State per pupil expenditure multiplied by Indian pupil enrollment summed across all eligible districts. Just over 10% of the total authorization was awarded to districts submitting approved applications in fiscal year 1973. The final grant award amount is based on a proportional reduction which adjusts total expenditures to the appropriate funding.

For the non-LEA's 35 applications were received in fiscal year 1974; of these 23 were approved in the amount of $1,190,476. In fiscal year 1973 10 non-LEA grants were approved in the amount of $547,618.

Grants and Funding

The growth in the numbers of projects and numbers of Indian students involved during the short term of operation is an indication of the acceptability of the intent of the Act and an active recognition of the need for the Act by both the grantee agencies and the Indian communities.

TABLE II

FY 1973 AND 1974 GRANTS AND FUNDING

	Number of Grantees		Amount of Funding	
	1973	1974	1973	1974
Part A	436	854	$11,000,000.00	$23,809,518.54
Non-LEA's	10	23	547,618.00	1,190,476.00
Part B	51	136	5,000,000.00	12,000,000.00
Part C	10	42	500,000.00	3,000,000.00
Totals	507	1,055	$17,047,618.00	$39,999,594.54

The mandated Indian involvement in grants made under the provisions of the IEA has provided the means for Indian parents to have, for the first time, a voice in the direction of their childrens' education. Conscientious school administrators are seeing the Act as a possible means for providing a higher quality and more relevant education for Indian pupils - an education that is meaningful to Indians within the framework of their chosen relationship to their own tribal culture and to the current majority society. Many project administrators feel that this opportunity to improve Indian education is enhanced and enlarged by the participation and direction lent by Indian parent committees.

Indian Pupil Enrollment

The increase in the numbers of students enrolled in funded districts in 1974-75 (see table III, last column) is 75,713. This represents a 57 percent increase over 1973-74. However, it should be kept in mind that the 1974-75 enrollment figure of 212,938 represents the total number of Indian

TABLE III

COMPARABLE ANALYSIS OF PART A PROJECTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1973 AND 1974

State	1973-74 School Districts Funded	1974-75 School Districts Funded	Percent Increase	FY 1973-74 Funding	FY 1974-75 Funding	Percent Increase	(In Funded Districts) 1973-74 Indian Student Enrollment	(In Funded Districts) 1974-75 Indian Student Enrollment	Percent Increase	FY 1973-74 Expenditures Per Indian Pupil	FY 1974-75 Expenditures Per Indian Pupil	Decrease In Number Of Students	Increase In Number Of Students
Alabama		3	300		$ 32,165.78	100	81	433	435		$ 74		352
Alaska	9	25	177	$ 1,532,982.28	3,706,936.07	142	10,757	18,371	70	$143	202		7,614
Arizona	24	49	104	1,440,024.19	2,217,633.05	154	19,292	21,482	11	75	103		2,190
California	17	122	617	107,715.45	1,223,819.22	1004	1,273	10,466	722	85	117		9,193
Connecticut	1		0	3,191.00			32			100		32	
Colorado	4	8	100	47,616.22	114,092.75	140	594	1,025	73	80	111		431
Florida	2	5	150	14,844.49	57,610.30	288	190	541	185	78	106		351
Georgia		1	100		1,752.82	100		22	100		80		22
Idaho	4	5	25	35,502.37	82,770.57	133	583	1,003	72	61	83		420
Illinois	1	2	100	14,899.67	161,326.32	983	150	1,250	733	99	129		1,100
Iowa	1	3	200	18,912.42	60,304.90	219	219	505	131	86	119		286
Kansas	2	5	150	13,611.27	99,439.54	631	174	952	447	78	104		778
Louisiana	1	8	700	6,320.02	308,997.34	4790	85	3,011	3442	74	103		2,926
Maine	2	9	350	10,588.74	51,582.42	387	148	520	251	72	99		372
Maryland	1	1		51,888.33	71,544.71	38	527	527		98	136		
Massachusetts		1	100		4,501.67	100		38	100		118		38
Michigan	13	85	554	113,915.42	839,544.22	637	1,179	6,285	433	97	134		5,106
Minnesota	18	41	128	669,760.21	1,190,175.19	778	6,710	8,703	30	100	137		1,993
Montana	28	34	21	480,590.30	872,825.67	82	6,039	8,094	85	80	108		2,055
Nebraska	4	11	175	18,790.53	167,056.90	989	233	1,533	558	81	109		1,300
Nevada	1	11	1000	15,625.59	294,617.77	1786	202	2,625	1199	77	55		295
New Mexico	13	14	8	1,391,986.25	1,920,983.99	38	19,642	19,937	2	71	96		295
New York	10	12	20	330,222.67	662,314.22	100	2,202	3,394	54	150	195		1,192
North Carolina	17	19	12	832,390.11	1,145,461.09	38	12,871	13,752	7	65	83		881
North Dakota	13	17	31	198,038.36	371,286.75	87	2,845	3,923	38	70	95		1,078
Ohio	2	2		29,029.39	37,642.14	30	381	363		76	104	18	
Oklahoma	165	205	24	1,650,210.19	4,296,848.94	160	25,826	50,148	94	64	86		24,322
Oregon	2	9	350	76,582.97	267,951.90	250	808	2,048	153	95	130		1,240
South Carolina		1	100		4,666.97	100		58	100		80		58
South Dakota	17	29	71	484,073.86	825,443.17	71	6,579	8,827	34	74	94		2,248
Texas		4	400		75,350.07	100		815	100		92		815
Utah	6	10	67	155,235.44	263,458.35	70	2,358	2,914	24	66	90		556
Virginia		2	200		8,227.21	100		80	100		103		80
Washington	29	67	131	699,674.57	1,523,920.56	118	7,907	12,755	61	88	119		4,848
West Virginia	1	1		1,507.97	3,140.34	108	22	34	55	69	92		12
Wisconsin	22	28	27	421,688.38	749,332.22	78	4,493	5,761	28	94	130		1,266
Wyoming	5	5		84,961.45	94,793.42	12	974	743		87	128	231	
	435	854	96	$10,952,366.00	$23,809,518.54	117	35,297	212,938	57	$81	$117	281	75,713

00222

pupils enrolled in the school districts having Title IV projects. This does not necessarily imply that all 212,938 pupils were actually served by Title IV projects; it means only that the opportunity to participate was available to the eligible children. The latest count of all Indian children of school age who are in public school systems (334,495) less the total number who are eligible for Title IV benefits because they are in funded districts (212,938) indicates that 121,587 public school Indian children are not being afforded the opportunity to participate in Title IV programs. The nonparticipants in Title IV programs are either attending school in ineligible LEA's or in eligible districts that have not applied for Title IV funds.

The total count of Indian pupils enrolled in public schools has drastically increased in some school districts in the 2 years since implementation of the Title IV IEA program. Eleven states (Alabama, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania) have more than doubled their enrollments since the fiscal year 1973 Indian pupil counts were made.

Two outstanding examples of this escalation can be noted in table IV, which shows the reported Indian pupil enrollment for each State. The total Indian enrollment in Alabama for fiscal year 1975 is more than 16 times greater than that for fiscal year 1973. The fiscal year 1975 total Indian enrollment in Louisiana is more than 20 times greater than the number reported for fiscal year 1973.

While many influences undoubtedly contribute to such changes, two major factors, closely related to the language and intent of the Act, should be considered.

One contributing factor is the Title IV definition of Indian. Under this definition, Indian pupils (such as urban, terminated and State-recognized Indians) who were formerly ineligible to participate in Bureau of Indian Affairs programs for Indian pupils can be served under the provisions of Title IV.

Another factor may be that school district administrators and members of the Indian community view Title IV funding as a highly desirable means of meeting the special needs of Indian students. As a result of this attitude, school administrators become eager to serve as many students as possible and search for those who qualify to be served under the Act. Parents and children who are Indian, but cannot qualify for tribal enrollment or Bureau of Indian Affairs benefits because they do not meet blood quantum requirements, have recognized a source of educational support and have claimed their Indian identity in order to participate in the Title IV program.

TABLE IV

REPORTED INDIAN PUPIL ENROLLMENT BY STATES

State	Number of Eligible Districts FY 1974	Projects Funded FY 1974	Indian Pupil Enrollment FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975
*Alabama	7	3	81	801	1,301
Alaska	32	25	15,888	18,990	61,928
Arizona	121	49	26,798	28,847	31,469
*Arkansas	11		519	448	1,246
*California	582	122	15,417	18,250	30,854
Colorado	34	8	2,309	2,377	2,627
Connecticut	19		303	209	445
Delaware	3		55	99	85
D.C.	1		18	25	28
Florida	38	5	2,390	2,137	2,806
Georgia	10	1	408	326	368
*Hawaii	1		0	0	73
Idaho	33	5	1,856	2,368	2,400
Illinois	23	2	2,204	2,059	2,059
Indiana	35		853	928	1,140
Iowa	16	3	664	822	833
Kansas	36	5	1,400	2,049	2,075
*Kentucky	3		44	251	384
*Louisiana	17	8	234	3,509	4,803
*Maine	17	9	239	601	686
Maryland	10	1	1,660	1,200	1,354
Massachusetts	16	1	278	459	459
*Michigan	150	85	4,554	7,827	13,015
Minnesota	117	41	9,660	10,170	11,385
*Mississippi	7		68	79	177
Missouri	21		934	918	872
Montana	80	34	10,795	12,036	11,207
Nebraska	28	11	2,826	1,958	2,082
Nevada	14	11	2,728	2,764	2,810
New Hampshire	2		23	13	23
New Jersey	13		290	216	224
New Mexico	28	14	21,883	23,074	23,964
New York	34	12	5,692	5,507	6,118
North Carolina	40	19	14,312	14,726	15,045
North Dakota	36	17	3,187	4,986	4,303
Ohio	18	2	1,017	1,004	942
Oklahoma	593	205	40,260	69,838	86,688
Oregon	50	9	2,367	3,570	3,919
*Pennsylvania			199	314	818

*FY 1975 enrollments have more than doubled since FY 73.

0024

State	Number of Eligible Districts FY 1974	Projects Funded FY 1974	Indian Pupil Enrollment FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975
Rhode Island	10		158	210	199
South Carolina	11	1	395	391	415
South Dakota	70	29	7,956	10,139	10,343
Tennessee	8		193	154	233
Texas	60	4	2,502	2,849	2,549
Utah	30	10	4,447	4,367	4,226
Vermont	2		22	20	20
Virginia	22	2	937	1,060	1,024
Washington	169	67	12,635	15,408	18,114
West Virginia	5	1	172	126	128
Wisconsin	99	28	6,098	7,317	7,847
Wyoming	10	5	1,219	1,189	1,382
	2,829	854	231,147	288,984	334,495

Per Pupil Expenditure of Title IV Grant Award Funds

In fiscal year 1973, the range of per pupil expenditure in Title IV projects varied from $61 in Idaho to $150 in New York. The total per pupil expenditure from all sources ranged from $670 in Idaho to $1,650 in New York.

In fiscal year 1974 all figures as shown in table III reflect an overall increase in per pupil expenditure based on grant amounts and district enrollment figures, which is consistent with the increased appropriation. The range varied from $74 in Alabama to $195 in New York.

The largest increase in Title IV per pupil expenditure occurred in Alaska, where $59 more per pupil was expended during the second year of operation. This was because total per pupil expenditure rose more between fiscal years 1973 and 1974 than it did in any other State. Two States, New York and Wyoming, increased their per pupil expenditure by more than $40 per pupil. Eleven States showed increases of more than $20. Only one State reported an increase of less than $20 ($18 in North Carolina). The relationship between size of grant and number of Indians with the recipient LEA for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 is shown in table V.

Size of Grants

During both years of the Title IV operation approximately 50 percent of the grants funded were under $10,000. The most noticeable change in funding levels was in the $20,000-$49,999 range; 14.7 percent of the 432

TABLE V

RELATION BETWEEN SIZE OF GRANT AND NUMBER OF INDIANS WITH THE RECIPIENT LEA, FY 1973 AND FY 1974

Size of Grant	NUMBER OF INDIANS IN LEA'S																TOTAL LEA'S			
	1-25		25-49		50-99		100-199		200-499		500-999		1000-4999		5000-9999		FY 73		FY 74	
	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	FY73	FY74	No.	%	No.	%
Under $1,000	15	6															15	9.5	6	.7
$ 1,000-$4,999	31	112	55	112	38	16		1									124	28.8	241	28.2
5,000-9,999			1	35	40	114	42	21	1	2							84	19.5	172	20.1
10,000-19,999		2			3	38	55	120	38	14	0	2	2				98	22.3	176	20.6
20,000-49,000							1	27	50	122	11	12	1				63	14.7	161	18.9
50,000-99,000						2			1	12	22	35	5	3			28	6.5	52	6.1
100,000-199,000											3	13	10	22			13	3.0	35	4.1
200,000-499,999													4	6	1		5	1.2	6	0.7
500,000-1,000,000														2	2	3	2	0.5	5	0.6
Total LEA's	46	120	56	147	81	170	98	169	90	150	36	62	22	33	3	3	432	100.0	854	100.0
Percent	10.6	14.0	13.0	17.0	18.8	19.9	22.7	19.9	20.8	17.6	8.3	7.2	5.1	4.0	0.7	14	100		100	

9200

grants were made on this level in fiscal year 1973. In fiscal year 1974, 18.9 percent of 854 grants were funded in this range. Except for a slight drop in the percentage of grants funded under $1,000 (from 3.5 percent in fiscal year 1973 to 0.7 percent in fiscal year 1974) very little difference appears in the proportional funding by level. During both years 11 percent of the total grants exceeded $50,000.

As in fiscal year 1973, districts with larger enrollments of Indian pupils received larger grants.

In fiscal year 1973, the largest number of grants (98) was made to districts with Indian pupil enrollments between 100 and 199 students, and ranged from $5,000 to $20,000. In fiscal year 1974, the largest number (114) of grants fell in the $5,000 to $10,000 category, and were awarded to districts with Indian pupil enrollments between 50 and 99 students.

0027

APPLICATIONS

A total of 1681 applications for Title IV funding was received for the program's second year. Of these, 1133 were requests for Part A funding; 438, for Part B funding; and 110, for Part C funding. These applications represented increases over the first-year applications of 100.7 percent, 19 percent and 51 percent for Parts A, B, and C, respectively.

Part A Summary

Applications were required to include a statement of needs relevant to the intended clients of the project. In the Part A-LEA applications, the three most frequently identified needs were (1) personal or social needs relative to self-concept, self-image, or image of self as an Indian, (2) background inadequacies in terms of materials, supplies, texts, or library materials, and (3) curricular inadequacies in the area of Indian studies. Part A-LEA applicants' program objectives were responsive to these identified needs, the three most often proposed objectives being (1) to develop Indian studies curriculums, (2) to improve self-image or concept of self as an Indian, and (3) to develop general academic curriculum or materials.

Creation of new services was the chief purpose of 57.9 percent of the Part A-LEA applicant projects, while 20.3 percent proposed not to create new services but rather to intensify, improve, or extend existing services. Another 19.5 percent proposed both to create new services and to improve existing services.

As to the grade levels served by Title IV projects, over half the projects were either kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) or first through twelfth (1-12). The rest proposed serving specific grade categories between kindergarten and the twelfth grade. More than 71 percent of the programs were intended to serve off-reservation Indian populations, over 14 percent were intended to serve on-reservation Indian populations, and over 12 percent were intended to serve both.

Part A: Comparison of First Year's Applications and Second Year's Applications

The number of fiscal year 1974 Part A-LEA projects is 50.9 percent larger than the first year's total of 435. A comparison of the needs

identified in the 2 years' applications reveals some changes in relative emphasis, as shown in table VI for those needs which were identified in more than 15 percent of the applications. In the second year's applications, there were proportionately far fewer mentions of (1) needs for social adjustment or acceptance, (2) understaffing, (3) staff lack of knowledge and understanding of Indians, and (4) inadequacies relative to counseling programs or vocational and career guidance. On the other hand, there were proportionately far more mentions of (1) educational achievement needs relative to low motivation or negative school attitude, (2) curricular inadequacies in mathematics or remedial mathematics, (3) lack of teachers and aides of Indian ancestry, (4) inadequate equipment, (5) inadequate materials, supplies, texts, or library materials, and (6) inadequacies in terms of tutorial programs.

A comparison of the objectives proposed in the first and second year Part A applications also shows differences in relative emphasis. (See table VII.) Proportionately fewer applications mentioned objectives in (1) improving social adjustment or life skills, (2) improving self-image or concept of self as an Indian (although the percentage of second year applicants who proposed this objective was still very high: 46.6 percent), (3) language arts/remedial language, or general communication skills, (4) speech, drama, or performing arts, (5) career education, and (6) staff enlargement. On the other hand, a few objectives were emphasized to a proportionately much greater extent in the second year's application: (1) Indian studies, (2) staff work with Indian consultants, and (3) development of curriculum or materials. The latter three emphases may signal in part a consolidation of project efforts into fewer, more critical areas of focus for Indian children. There is the strong suggestion that much of the school district management and the Indian communities believe that a strong direct relationship exists between Indian studies (with Indian input) and the improvement of Indian students' self-image, attendance, and academic achievement.

Rejection of Applications

Of second year Part A-LEA applications, 248 were rejected; the most frequent reason was too little Indian community involvement (at least 84 denials). Table VIII gives the reasons for denial in the 182 cases which were analyzed.

TABLE VI

CHANGES IN RELATIVE EMPHASIS OF FREQUENTLY IDENTIFIED NEEDS:
COMPARISON OF PART A APPLICATIONS FOR FY 1974 AND FY 1975

Needs Identified	Percent of Funded Applications For FY 1974	Percent of All Applications For FY 1975	Changes
Personal or Social Needs:			
Social Adjustment/Peer Acceptance	43.2	9.5	(33.7)
Self-Concept/Image/Image as Indian	50.3	55.6	5.3
Educational Achievement Needs:			
Dropout Rate	31.7	24.0	(- 7.7)
Absenteeism	22.5	17.6	(- 4.9)
Low Grades	31.3	36.7	5.4
Low Test Scores	23.0	16.9	(-6.1)
Low Motivation/Negative School Attitude	.5	23.9	23.4
Curricular Inadequacies:			
Reading/Remedial Reading	9.4	27.5	18.1
Math/Remedial Math	5.3	15.8	10.5
Indian Studies/Culture	53.8	50.0	(-3.8)
Staff Inadequacies:			
Understaffed	32.6	11.1	(-21.5)
Lack of Knowledge & Understanding of Indians	28.5	11.3	(-17.2)
Lack of Teachers and Aides of Indian Ancestry	.7	18.0	17.3
Background Inadequacies:			
Equipment	19.5	30.5	11.5
Materials, Supplies, Texts, Library Materials	27.4	64.2	36.8
Special Services Inadequacies:			
Counseling Program/Vocational-Career Guidance	46.9	29.7	(-17.2)
Community/Parent Relations	26.7	21.8	4.9
Tutorial Program	1.4	21.8	20.4

TABLE VII

CHANGES IN RELATIVE EMPHASIS OF FREQUENTLY PROPOSED OBJECTIVES: COMPARISON OF PART A APPLICATIONS FOR FY 1974 AND FY 1975

Objectives	Percent of Funded Applications For FY 1974	Percent of All Applications For FY 1975	Change
Social Adjustment, Counseling Program Development:			
Improve Social Adjustment/Life Skills	29.9	11.5	(-18.4)
Improve Self-Image/Concept of Self as Indian	54.0	46.6	(- 7.4)
Curriculum Development, Objectives:			
Language Arts/Remedial Language/ General Community Skills	38.2	15.0	(-23.2)
Reading/Remedial Reading	31.7	27.2	(- 4.5)
Math/Remedial Math	19.5	15.7	(- 3.8)
Speech/Drama/Performing Arts	25.5	.9	(-24.6)
Indian Studies	30.6	48.8	18.2
Career Education	20.9	7.4	(-13.5)
Staff Development:			
To Be Enlarged	65.1	29.0	(-36.1)
To Receive Training	16.6	17.6	1.0
To Work With Indian Consultants	22.3	31.8	9.5
To Employ Paraprofessionals/Aides	24.8	25.3	.5
To Improve Community Relations/ School-Family Communication/ Attitude Toward School	26.4	22.8	(- 3.6)
To Develop Curriculum/Materials	12.9	35.1	22.2

TABLE VIII

DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR FY 1974 FUNDING

Reasons for Denial	Number
Application Incomplete	23
Application Ineligible	11
Monetary Arrangements Unacceptable	4
Proposal/Narrative Weak	20
Evaluation/Dissemination Lacking/Vague	30
Indian/Community Involvement Low	84
Low Priority/Not Worth Funding	2
Other	8
Total Cases Analyzed	182

PERFORMANCE REPORTS

Table IX shows the tabulation of the required reporting on accomplishment of project objectives by Part A-LEA projects for fiscal year 1973. Virtually all projects reported complete accomplishment of their objectives. However, these reported goal attainments were determined by a variety of means, depending on local level interpretation and application of the language of the Act and Federal rules and regulations.

The law specifies that "appropriate objective measurement of educational achievement" be adopted for annual evaluation and that the "extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the educational opportunities of Indian students..." also be reported. It is further stipulated by the legislation that policies and procedures "will insure that the program for which assistance is sought will be operated and evaluated in consultation with, and the involvement of, parents of the children and representatives of the area to be served, including the committee...." Because of the lack of more specific guidelines, project performance reports were not consistent in focus, process, time and effort involved, quality of data or qualifications of evaluative personnel.

The development of a program monitoring and process evaluation design which can be used by all projects for reporting will contribute greatly to the validity and completeness of evaluation information and will furnish a better base for reporting degree of project goal achievement.

TABLE IX

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES BY TYPE OF OBJECTIVE - PART A
FIRST YEAR PROGRAMS (FY 1973)

Type of Objective	# Districts Having This Objective	Districts Reporting Full Accomplishment This Objective	
		Number	Percent
Staff Development	292	280	95.9
Staff Increase	299	268	89.6
Curriculum Development	369	344	93.2
Equipment and/or Materials	321	306	95.3
Meeting Health Needs	160	138	86.3
Teacher Aides/Paraprofessionals	162	148	91.4
Counseling	323	310	96.0
Tutoring	219	210	95.9
Language Development	85	79	92.9
Communication Skills	154	137	89.0
Bilingual Education	29	26	89.7
Fine Arts/Crafts	101	96	95.0
Social Adjustment	265	253	95.5
Recreation/Physical Education	41	41	100.0
Other Objectives	1	1	100.0

0033

EVALUATION IMPROVEMENT EFFORT

Because IEA emphasizes local program evaluation, the national Program Monitoring and Program Evaluation System is being constructed so as to draw its data from local evaluation designs to the maximum feasible extent. It is therefore imperative that the local evaluation designs meet certain standards of quality; for example, the processes and products of the projects must be specified in detail and the means of measuring the specified processes and products must be described.

Although all funded fiscal year 1974 Title IV projects assured in their application that program evaluation would be done, in many cases these designs were far from complete by the fall of 1974. Moreover, there was no standard methodology for carrying out program evaluation -- the lack of which reflects the wide variations in evaluation practice in the field of education in general.

In order to offer means of improving field evaluation processes, two series of conferences were developed -- a series of 3 five-day Quality Control Conferences and 10 three-day Field Capability Improvement workshops.

Quality Control Conferences

Invitations to participate in the series of three Quality Control Conferences were sent to the 60 largest Part A-LEA projects. The general purpose of these conferences, each of which built upon the previous conference experience, was to instruct the participants in evaluation methods and to reach agreement among them on a reasonable, practical, and feasible plan for gathering and reporting evaluative information into the national system. Overall, 44 projects actually participated. These combined projects represented $8,295,951 (or 34.8 percent) of Part A-LEA funding and 69,832 (or 32.8 percent) of all Indian students covered by fiscal year 1974 Part A-LEA projects. The first conference, held in October 1974, dealt with the concepts of evaluation and needs assessment and with the rationale for the national evaluation system design. The second conference, held in November 1974, emphasized the techniques of evaluation design and measurement. Assignments pertinent to the national system were completed between the conferences. The third conference, held in March 1975, provided an opportunity for detailed review and refinement of fiscal year 1974 evaluation designs and of evaluation plans for fiscal year 1975; the conference concluded with statements of intent by the participants concerning the types of data to be reported by their projects and schedules for delivery of those data for the first National Report by October 30, 1975.

0034

Participants were asked to make overall evaluations of the Quality Control Conferences; these are shown in table X.

Field Capability Improvement Conferences

It is the clear intent of IEA that there be local assessment of needs, local determination of program content and methods of delivery, and local evaluation of Title IV programs. Since many projects are staffed by persons new to these responsibilities, a series of 10 three-day training conferences were conducted in strategic locations around the Nation. Representatives of 165 projects from 25 states participated in these conferences in which the main topics were needs assessment and program evaluation. Over 61 percent of the participants were Indians or Alaskan Natives. Participants studied and practiced needs assessment and evaluation methodologies, using their own projects as frames of reference. Several participants desiring to reinforce their learning came to two separate conferences, although the agendas were the same; and several projects sent additional staff members to a subsequent conference after attending an initial one. At the end of the conference, 59 percent of the participants responded to a conference evaluation questionnaire. Of these responses, 44.6 percent gave their conference an overall rating of "very useful," 48.9 percent "somewhat useful," 5.0 percent "not very useful," and 1.5 percent gave no overall rating. No one rated his conference "not at all useful."

The participants' perceived needs for technical assistance to their projects were also assessed informally; the results of the assessments are described below.

Needs for Technical Assistance

During the two sets of conferences participants were asked to identify and discuss their projects' most important needs for technical assistance. Results of these informal needs assessments are shown in Table XI -- grouped according to categories suggested by analysis of the individual project responses. There are 10 categories of kinds of need and 3 categories of ways in which the needs should be met (i.e.. training, information-giving, and advice-giving). Overall, these projects most needed information about how to interpret the applicable Federal regulations and the Office of Indian Education application instructions and reporting requirements. The second most frequently identified need was for advice concerning evaluation skills and services. The third most frequently identified need was for advice on curriculum development or materials.

TABLE X

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF USEFULNESS OF QUALITY CONTROL CONFERENCES
(By percentage of those responding)

	Denver I	Denver II	Albuquerque
Very Useful	56.4%	60.0%	72.2%
Somewhat Useful	31.0%	40.0%	27.8%
Not Very Useful	12.6%	0%	0%
Not At All Useful	0%	0%	0%
Responses	32	20	32
Non-Responses	14	15	3

0036

TABLE XI

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IDENTIFYING EACH NEED AS AMONG THEIR PROJECTS" THREE HIGHEST PRIORITY NEEDS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Projects' Technical Assistance Needs*	Part A - LEA's				Part A - Non-LEA's				Part B				Part C				Totals			
	Info	Advice	Training	Total	Info	Advice	Training	Total	Info	Advice	Training	Total	Info	Advice	Training	Total	Info	Advice	Training	Total
Interpretations of (a) Fed. Regs. pertaining to Title IV, (b) OIE application instructions, and (c) OIE reporting requirements	30			30	1			1	11			11	2			2	44			44
Evaluation skills and services	7	22	3	32		2	1	3	2	10	9	21		8	1	9	9	42	14	65
Curriculum Development on Materials	6	11		17	2	4		6	1	11	2	14	1	10	2	13	10	36	4	50
Program planning development, implementation, management, and needs assessment (if not included under other needs)	4	13		17			3	3		8	4	12		1		1	4	22	7	33
Proposal/application writing	1	5	4	10	1	1		2		16	2	18		1		1	2	23	6	31
Improvement in staff skills (if not included under other training needs)	1		10	11			4	4	1	11	1	13			3	3	2	11	18	31
Parent Committee on Advisory Board functions	1	11	8	20			1	1			3	3					1	11	12	24
Information about what other projects are doing	8			8	2			2	3			3		1		1	14			14
Improving community-School relations, Board - Staff relations, parent committee - LEA relations		10		10						1		1			1	1		11	1	12
Financial management accounting, bookkeeping		1		1			1	1	1	4	4	9					1	5	5	11
TOTALS	58	73	25	156 100%	6	7	10	23 100%	19	61	25	105 100%	4	20	7	31 100%	87	161	67	315 100%
Number of Respondents				63				8				31				11				113

*These categories of need were developed from the responses in order to estimate their commonalities

2300

FIELD STUDY

Introduction

Information on project operations is a necessary evaluation component of the Indian Educatior Act. In order to produce more valid and complete field operations data than has been collected in the evaluation of other Federal programs, and to convert it into program information in a timely manner, a prototype and reporting system was designed to be utilized in 1974-75. In the interim between the years 1973 and 1974, information from the field was gathered through an interview and monitoring study of Indian Education Act Projects rather than the usually used mail survey.

Description of the Study

Core information interview schedules were developed which were expandable according to the size and nature of the project. Three forms were directed toward all projects; these addressed the director, the staff, and the parent committee.

The interview schedule for project directors covered several areas of special information:

1. Biographical
2. Background information about the district, such as the directors' schedule, school organization, pupil enrollment, Indian enrollment, number of schools with Indian enrollment, and Federal funding participation
3. Project objectives, activities, and participants
4. Components of needs in the district
5. Variations in the interactions of staff, parent committee, and project directors in carrying out the IEA program
6. Interviewers' comments on quality of data obtained during the interview

The staff member questionnaire sought data similar to that obtained from the project director. The parent committee chairperson interview schedule was parallel to the project directors' questionnaire in that it

sought a description of the parent committee members' awareness of the objectives, descriptions of how the parent committee works, and details on the parent committees' participation in IEA project operations and evaluation. The parent committee questionnaire also sought comparable information in terms of their relationships with those of the staff and the project director. In all cases, information about the quality of the data was obtained from the interviewer.

The three survey instruments used with Parts B and C projects were very similar in structure to those used for Part A projects. The major difference between the two sets of instruments was that the instruments for Parts B and C were designed to obtain data relating to nonpublic school system administration, whereas the instruments for Part A were designed to collect data relating to public school system organizational structure and administration procedures.

A random selection was made of almost 30 percent of the questionnaires for the establishment of coding categories and formulation of the data for automated processing. During this review process, the quality of the data was verified and the review indicated that the data was in excellent condition.

A stratified sample consisting of 105 Part A-LEA projects was selected to be interviewed along with all 63 B and C projects. (The stratification of Part A projects was made on the basis of size by dollars with the exception of Alaska, where the basis was the percentage and number of children as well as dollar amounts.) The number of interviews increased proportionally with the dollar amount of the project.

Results of the Study

The analysis of the field study data was completed primarily with two goals in mind. The first was to estimate the effectiveness of the project; the second was to provide descriptive information about the way in which projects are planned, operated, and evaluated. For this report, results relating to the first goal will be examined. National projections were drawn for Part A, but simple frequencies were used for Parts B and C projects because of the inability to describe the national population of these types of grantees. Selected analyses involving major questions have been summarized for this report.

Perhaps the most important item on both the project director forms and the parent committee forms is the item which solicits a rating of success of the project. On that item, 90 percent of the project directors rated their project very effective, in at least some ways. Over 50 percent of these project directors rated the program very effective in most aspects. Only 6 percent rated their projects ineffective. (See listing on pages 2-3 of parent committee and project director project-effectiveness ratings.)

Responses were also elicited to the question of whether or not the projects were properly targetted. Of the 93 percent of the project directors who responded, 60 percent gave a definite "yes" reply, and 33 percent gave a guarded or mixed reply. Only one project director said "no." Parent committee members gave 54 percent "yes" responses, 6 percent "no" responses, and 28 percent mixed or guarded responses.

The project director, staff member, and parent committee members were each asked to list the objectives of the project. These objectives were coded under 20 categories.

Cross-tabulation of three sets of objectives indicate either a gross difference of usage in terminology or very uneven knowledge of the project across the three respondent levels. Areas where disagreement occurs appear to be those which are most subject to the influence of different perspectives; for instance, what might be considered as a counseling objective by the project director (since the counselor was hired by the project director to advise in dropout project activities) may be considered a cultural enlightenment objective to the teacher since its content is based upon tribal tradition. The same project may be considered to have a self-concept objective by the parent whose child is showing new self-opinions. Nevertheless, most of the projects appear to be concentrating on counseling, remedial, general academic, cultural enrichment, and self-concept objectives. The fiscal year 1974 objectives appear much more child-directed than those objectives in Title IV projects for fiscal year 1973.

In looking at the major problems discussed by the parent committee and the project director, it appears that different perspectives are influencing communication. The parent committee members and the project director appear to have different interpretations of what is discussed in meetings. The project directors tend to categorize problems, but the parent committee seems to classify many problems under the general category of program operation.

Table XII shows the categories identified as major problems and the percentages of parent committee members and project directors who perceived these as major problems.

Problems of communication similar to those found in the data in table XII are also found in the data relating to the areas of most concern to project directors and parent committee members. The areas of concern most frequently mentioned by project directors are communications (22 percent) and funding (17 percent). The parent committee members reported the school system (75 percent) (this could include both staffing and funding) and the severity of needs (23 percent).

The cost effectiveness information shown in table XIII indicate that when projects invested in staff and materials the additional funding appeared to raise the level of effectiveness.

TABLE XII

MAJOR PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED BY PARENT COMMITTEE AND PROJECT DIRECTORS

Major Problem	Parent Committee	Project Director
Staffing	7%	25%
Communication	14%	19%
Severity of Children's Needs	20%	20%
Community Interest	4%	14%
School System	17%	15%
Funding	5%	30%
Program Operations	15%	32%
Construction	3%	3%

TABLE XIII

COST EFFECTIVENESS ON PROJECTS JUDGED AS REACHING STUDENTS

	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	
Personnel	25,604	24,397	22,611	13.2%
Fringe	22,250	22,452	22,250	
Travel	22,250	22,452	22,250	
Equipment	23,081	22,658	22,250	3.7%
Supplies	23,372	22,844	22,250	5.0%
Contractual	22,250	22,658	22,250	
Construction	22,250	22,844	22,250	
Indirect Charges	22,250	22,250	22,250	
Other	22,250	22,250	22,250	
TOTAL	205,557	204,805	200,611	
		.4%	2.1%	
		2.5%		

It should be noted that the percentage difference between "somewhat effective" and "very effective" in Personnel median expenditure is 13.2 percent.

The second most cost-effective expenditure is for supplies which shows a 5.0 percent increase as shown in table XIII.

0041

CONCLUSIONS

Four conclusions appear worthy of comment from the perliminary analysis of the field study data:

1. The projects appear to be addressing the needs of the Indian community and although the early proposals appeared not to be based on good rapport with the community, the projects in operation after the second year seem to be acquiring community support.

2. To date there is strong evidence to suggest project effectiveness.

3. There is a large range of communication problems between the school administration and the Indian community. This indicates a need for more involvement of school administration and Indian community at the level of standardizing terminology and concepts for mutual understanding.

4. Financial support appears to be best spent in the area of special staff.

0042

POSSIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

1. Plan and implement action to improve communication, both horizontally and vertically among all people involved in Title IV. (Field study data shows that 14 percent of parent committees and 19 percent of the project directors identified lack of communication as a major problem.)

2. Develop and implement immediate delivery of technical assistance to projects at all levels of functions of IEA projects. Technical assistance needs of parent committees, project directors and school administrators in the areas of communication, program management, budget, application, reporting, specialized staffing, curriculum and materials development, and evaluation is vital to improved project efficiency at this time.

3. Support and encourage the recruitment, training, and placement of teachers and administrators for districts that have Indian pupil enrollment.

4. Develop an information dissemination center, where services are available to everyone about the Title IV IEA projects. This should include basic information about project goals, objectives, and activities so that information about successful activities can be shared.

5. Extend the potential benefits of the Act to include preschool children, and out-of-school youth and allow for interdistrict programs for districts with fewer than 10 Indian pupils.